UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/511,751	10/19/2004	Takuji Maeda	2004 1604A	6717	
	52349 7590 12/22/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
2033 K. STREET, NW SUITE 800			BAYOU, YONAS A		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2434		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/22/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/511,751	MAEDA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	YONAS BAYOU	2434
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron the, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 alore</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 18-26,32 and 33 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 18-26,32 and 33 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2004 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	oate

Application/Control Number: 10/511,751 Page 2

Art Unit: 2434

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicant's response filed on 12/03/2008.

- 2. Claims 18-26 and 32-33 are pending.
- 3. Claims 1-17 and 27-31 are cancelled.
- 4. Claims 18 and 32-33 are amended.
- 5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 6. When responding to the Office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the reference(s) cited or the objection made. A showing of how the amendments avoid such references or objections must also be present. See 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/03/2008 has been entered.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,751 Page 3

Art Unit: 2434

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-26 and 32-33 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-26 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama et al., Pub. No.: US 2001/0029526 A1 in view of Okada et al., Patent Number: 6,049,670.

Referring to claims 18-21, 24, 32 and 33, Yokoyama teaches wherein the program includes a program body running on the information processing terminal and program specific information for running said program body [paragraphs 53-55 and figs. 5-11], and

Yokoyama further teaches a decision unit operable to (i) decided whether or not the terminal ID attached to the program obtainment request received by the receiving

Art Unit: 2434

unit is recorded in the first table [paras. 9, 53-54, 124 and figs. 5-11, 24; inherently request received from the information processing terminal and request also attached inherently to the terminal ID (the home terminal has its own terminal ID)] (ii) to distribute only the program body of the identified program to the information processing terminal by prohibiting distribution of the program specific information of the identified program in a case where the decision unit decides that the terminal ID is recorded in the first table [paragraph 124 and fig. 24], and (iii) in case where the decision unit decides that the terminal ID is not recorded in the first table, add, to the first table, the terminal ID and the program specific information, such that the added terminal ID and the program specific information have a corresponding relationship identified in the first table, and distribute the program body and the program specific information, as the identified program to the information processing terminal wherein the distributed program specific information is for revoking the information processing terminal from attempting an unauthorized use of the identified program [paragraphs 45, 55, 69 and figs. 2, 13 and 17; mobile agent corresponding to program which includes terminal ID and service program data which includes program-specific information (see fig. 6)]. Yokoyama does not appear to explicitly teach a table holding unit operable to hold a first table identifying a relationship between a previously distributed program and a terminal ID; wherein the information processing terminal stores the terminal ID such that the stored terminal ID cannot be re-written externally. However, Okada teaches the hidden file method is used in a computer using MSDOS, and the user can only find the hidden file by a special operation. Therefore, it becomes very difficult to duplicate the terminal identifier and the

Art Unit: 2434

terminal password if they are written in a hidden file [column 11, lines 30-34]. Yokoyama and Okada are analogous art because both teach software/program distribution system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yokoyama to include the hidden file method is used in a computer using MSDOS, and the user can only find the hidden file by a special operation of Okada because it becomes very difficult to duplicate the terminal identifier and the terminal password if they are written in a hidden file, please see KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S-, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007) for further interpretation.

Referring to claims 22 and 23, Yokoyama teaches wherein the prescribed value is a value indicating the number of distributions that the program specific information is allowed to be distributed from the server apparatus to the information processing terminal [paragraph 11; traveling list corresponding to number of distributions].

Referring to claim 25, Yokoyama teaches the server apparatus holds a plurality of program specific information which is information that is different for each of the information processing terminal, and holds one program body which is common for each information processing terminal [paragraph 55 and fig. 6].

Referring to claim 26, Yokoyama teaches wherein the table holding unit holds a fifth table identifying a relationship between a program body ID uniquely identifying the program body of the identified program and the terminal ID of the information processing terminal on which the program body runs [paragraph 55 and fig. 6], and

Wherein the decision unit, by referring to the fifth table (i) determines that the program body of the identified program can be distributed in a case where the program ID and the terminal ID attached to the program obtainment request transmitted from the information processing terminal are identified in the fifth table as having a correspondence and (ii) determines that the program body of the identified program cannot be distributed in a case where the program ID and the terminal ID attached to the program obtainment request transmitted from the information processing terminal are not identified in the fifth table as having a correspondence [paragraph 123-124 and figs. 23-24].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YONAS BAYOU whose telephone number is (571)272-7610. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571-272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,751

Art Unit: 2434

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yonas Bayou/

Examiner, Art Unit 2434

12/11/2008

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434